REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-16 were pending in this application. Claims 1 and 5-8 have been amended and claims 9-16 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-8 will be pending herein upon entry of this Amendment, of which claims 1 and 5 are independent claims. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 were rejected to for informalities and claims 5, 9, and 13 were rejected under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. In addition, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,761,462 to Yoshida ("Yoshida") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,608,614 to Johnson ("Johnson",) claims 2, 6, 10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Johnson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,012,632 to Stone, and claims 3, 7, 11, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Johnson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,949,346 to Suzuki et al. To the extent these grounds of rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to overcome the objection raised by the Examiner and deleted claims 9-16 to overcome the "double patenting" objection.

Amended claims 1 and 5 relate to input devices that emit different colors of light so that a user has different senses of sight. As recited in amended claims 1 and 5, the input device includes a first light source, a second light source, a cap and a control module. The control module controls the light emission of the first and the second light sources. Once the first light source is emitting a first light, the second light source is turned off, and vice versa. The cap of the input device includes a first portion and a second portion. As described in the specification at, for example paragraph [0011], first portion 112, as a light filter, allows most of first light 132 to pass and substantially blocks most of second light 142. Similarly, second portion 114, as a light filter, allows most of second light 142 to pass and substantially blocks most of first light 132. More particularly, when the input device is in a first state, the control module controls the first light source to emit the first light to both the first and second portion, but the first portion displays more brightness than the second portion, and the second portion filters out most of the first light (the second light source turns off at this time). When the input device is in a second state, the control module controls the second light source to emit the second light to both the first and second portion, but the second portion displays more brightness than the first portion and the first portion filters out most of the second light (the first light source turns off at this time). Thus, a user can recognize different states of the input device precisely and conveniently.

Yoshida fails to teach or suggest the feature of filtering a light, but merely provides a device for allowing a first color printing pattern on the key top surface to be more conspicuous, compared to another complementary color printing pattern on the key top surface, under the key top surface illuminated by the complementary color backlight,

and the first color printing pattern would be hard to see under the key top surface illuminated by a first color backlight. Besides, as described in column 2, lines 7-24, Yoshida describes that the key tops are made of transparent or semitransparent resin, in order to make the printed characters, for example, the numeral patterns 21 and 22 with black paint, the kana patterns 31 and 32 with green paint, and the English character patterns 41 and 42 with red paint, are conspicuous in the condition that the corresponding backlights are complementary. Apparently, Yoshida fails to teach or suggest any "light-filtering" feature.

Further, as described in column 2, lines 57-61 of Yoshida, when a kana input is selected, the lighting color of the backlight is red. Therefore, the English character patterns 41, 42 printed with red are hard to see. To the contrary, the kana patterns 31, 32 printed with green are conspicuous since green and red are complementary. Indeed, Yoshida only discloses printed patterns with different colors so that under different backlights, the printed patterns appear with different visual distinguishable levels. Therefore, the concept used in Yoshida is totally different from that of the present invention, as recited in amended claims 1 and 5.

Johnson relates to a blacklight for a liquid-crystal display including a first LED array and a second LED array. A combing element combines the light from the first LED array and the second LED array. A controller is operationally connected with the second LED that adjusts the brightness of at least one LED in the second LED array, thereby adjusting the chromaticity of the combined light. The controller of Johnson, however, is not equivalent to the control module, as recited in amended claims 1 and 5 of the present application, that controls a first light source and a second light source, whereby once the

first light source emits the first light, the second light source is turned off, and once the second light source emits the second light, the first light source is turned off.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Yoshida nor Johnson, in combination thereof, teaches or suggest the input device recited in amended claims 1 and 5. Since Yoshida fails to teach or suggest the "light-filtering" features of amended claims 1 and 5 and the control system described in Johnson is not equivalent to the control module of amended claims 1 and 5, it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Yoshida and Johnson to achieve the input device of amended claims 1 and 5.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1 and 5 are patentable over Yoshida in view of Johnson. Dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also believed to be patentable at least due to their dependencies from patentable independent claims 1 and 5.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel:

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 24, 2005

By: _____
Michael Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

MB/ dkp
Customer No. 28970